

NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
January 2001
Chicago, IL

Meeting One: Thursday, January 11, 2:00 – 5:00 P.M., Washington Convention Center,
Room 1

Present:

Committee Members: Susan Anderson, Lynn Chmelir, Martha Kyrillidou, Bill Miller, Carolyn Norman, Leland Park, Stanley Wilder

Ex-officio: Denise Davis (NCLIS), Pat Garner (Census), Julia Glynn (minutes recorder), Mary Jo Lynch (ALA), Johnny Monaco (Census), Cindy Sheckells (Census), Hugh Thompson (ACRL), Jeff Williams (NCES)

1. Preliminaries
 - a. Introductions
 - b. Logistics (Dinner at Luigino's, 12th St. at 6:30 P.M.)
 - c. Minutes approved
 - d. Agenda approved
2. 1998 Survey Results (Jeff Williams)

File is now complete. Contractor is producing EDTABS report, draft is due at NCES next week. Adjudication review is due soon. Complete report expected to be released on the Web by late Spring or early Summer. There will not be a paper report.
3. Status of peer search program (Jeff Williams)

Two software programs are being developed. One is for the public based on the 1998 data and is almost complete. The other is for the collection phase. It will allow librarians who have entered and locked their data to see results from others who have done the same. Both are expected to be operational by mid to late February.
4. Status report on 2000 data collection (Pat Garner)

Pat Garner distributed copies of the following reports:

 - Reporting Status by Sector as of 1/11/01 (2 versions)
 - Reporting Status Summary for ALS2000 as of 1/10/01
 - Not registered by state (gives number for each state)
 - Registered no data by state (gives number for each state)

The group talked at length about why 30% had not yet registered and what to do about it. Some reasons for non-registration included:

- No carrot (no peer search tool)
- No stick (not mandatory)
- People dislike surveys of all types so multiple reminders are always necessary.

Ideas for what to do included:

- Asking LRs to help again
- Posting message to listservs for: Oberlin Group, CCJCS, ARL data reporters, ACRL general list

NCES intends to send reminder letter to CEOs of all institutions where library is not yet registered. Mary Jo Lynch will meet later today with Jeff Williams and Census staff to plan message to LRs.

5. ACRL (Hugh Thompson)

Copies of the 1998 ACRL survey report are sold out. 1999 survey is done. Print copies of the data are available for purchase and web site will be up soon. Response rate for 1999 was 43%, up from 1998's rate of 35%. Goal is to achieve a response rate of 60-75%.

6. ARL (Martha Kryillidou)

ARL is involved in three major statistics projects:

- The LibQUAL+ project, developed in conjunction with Texas A&M University during 1999-2000, is a large-scale, user-based assessment of library service effectiveness across multiple universities. Twelve ARL institutions participated in the pilot survey administered in spring 2000, using a modified version of the SERVQUAL instrument to gather data via the web from some 5,000 patrons. Starting in October 2000, a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) is allowing ARL and Texas A&M to refine the questions, dimensions, and data-gathering processes and to develop a service that ARL will provide on demand to academic libraries.
- The E-Metrics project will explore the feasibility of collecting data on the usage of electronic resources. See Document MW #277.
- The Higher Education Outcomes project will collaboratively develop a strategy for involving research libraries in campus assessment activities and to demonstrate the value of the library to the learning community.

7. Oberlin Group (Leland Park)

No changes to annual statistics form. Fast responses, as per usual.

8. Edit Checks

The group discussed the edit checks prepared by Census for the ALS2000. Johnny Monaco explained what was done to create the edit checks, and Pat Garner described a few cases where she had to "trick" the edit check to allow a library to enter data. Since only 15% of potential respondents have entered data at this point, it was decided to review the edit checks again at the next meeting. Pat will tell us which ones presented serious problems.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
January 2001
Chicago, IL

Meeting Two: Friday, January 12, 9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M., Renaissance Washington,
Room 2

Present:

Committee Members: Susan Anderson, Lynn Chmelir, Martha Kyrillidou, Bill Miller, Carolyn Norman, Leland Park, Stanley Wilder

Ex-officio: Denise Davis (NCLIS), Pat Garner (Census), Julia Glynn (minutes recorder), Mary Jo Lynch (ALA), Johnny Monaco (Census), Cindy Sheckells (Census), Hugh Thompson (ACRL), Jeff Williams (NCES)

9. Response to 2000 survey.

Mary Jo Lynch summarized the history of building and maintaining a network of Library Representatives (LR) in the states to assist NCES with the biennial survey. She remarked that the project assumes that the LRs will be contacting other librarians who are part of the library community in that state. This assumption is not valid, however, when the survey universe includes institutions that are not really part of that community. She noted that based on the handout entitled “Reporting States by Sector,” non-response was 76% for non-title IV and 22% for title IV. Martha suggested that NCES drop the non-title IV institutions from the universe for this survey – i.e., do not include them when calculating the response rate. Jeff agreed and noted that responses for non-title IV institutions is about 30% in all parts of IPEDS and that no imputation could be done for the sector.

10. Brainstorming on ALS beyond 2000

This discussion covered all of the topics listed on Part 8 of the agenda plus several others. Key point in the discussion were as follows:

- a. We should consider adapting the ARL method of dealing with electronic serials and books, i.e., if the way a title is paid for and catalogued is similar to what happens to print books and serials, the electronic title should be reported in a similarly way in the ALS. (Lynn Chmelir agreed to do that for now but suggested that the situation may change sometime soon.)
- b. We should NOT ask libraries to count the titles in packages put together by aggregators to which they lease access.
- c. If a publisher sells the electronic version and the print version of a title in a package, count the expenditure with other expenditures for electronic resources.
- d. We need to find out what resources are made available, at what cost, and who is paying (e.g., local budgets, state library, other).

- e. Digital Libraries. Several yes/no questions were suggested: Is the library producing digital documents? Are you involved in digital library projects?
 - f. Hours open is still important to count.
 - g. We need to find a way to measure use from outside the building.
 - h. We need a way to find out if the library is involved in formal assessment of user satisfaction (Martha recommends an article by Bonnie Gratch Lindaur in November 1998 issue of *College and Research Libraries*).
 - i. We might also ask if the library is included in institutional surveys of alumni and others regarding the institution as a whole.
 - j. We need to ask about library involvement in Information Literacy (note recent ACRL guidelines).
 - k. Wireless technology is very problematic and may not warrant a question.
 - l. We need to consider the connection between shared circulation systems and interlibrary loan statistics.
 - m. Section 8, "Staff," is probably okay as it is.
11. Schedule for developing the 2000 survey form
The group agreed to get down to specifics in San Francisco. Because of several projects that are currently in progress, we prefer to wait until Midwinter Meeting 2002 to make final decisions. Jeff Williams will check with NCES authorities to be sure that this is acceptable.

Meeting adjourned at noon.

January 26, 2001